

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

SEAN CRAWFORD,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROMEO ARANAS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:14-cv-00329-MMD-WGC

ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE WILLIAM G. COBB

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (dkt. no. 44) ("R&R") relating to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Motion for Summary Judgment. (Dkt. nos. 22, 23.) Plaintiff had until July 31, 2015, to object to the R&R. No objection to the R&R has been filed.

This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard

1 of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to
2 which no objections were made); see also *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219,
3 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the
4 view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an
5 objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then
6 the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., *Johnstone*, 263 F.
7 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to
8 which no objection was filed).

9 Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to
10 determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cobb's R&R. The Magistrate Judge
11 recommended granting summary judgment, finding that the undisputed facts do not
12 support Plaintiff's single claim that Defendants were deliberately indifferent to his serious
13 medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Upon reviewing the
14 Recommendation and underlying briefs, this Court finds good cause to adopt the
15 Magistrate Judge's R&R in full.

16 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and
17 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (dkt. no. 44) is accepted and
18 adopted in its entirety. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (dkt. no. 23) is
19 granted. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (dkt. no. 22) is denied as moot. Good cause
20 appearing, Defendants' motions for leave to file confidential documents under seal (dkt.
21 nos. 21, 40) are granted.

22 The Clerk is directed to enter judgment in favor of Defendants and close this
23 case.

24 DATED THIS 21th day of August 2015.



25
26 MIRANDA M. DU
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28